

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/697,419	10/26/2000	Alan McNutt	99 P 7938 US 01	5374	
75	90 10/18/2004		EXAMINER		
Elsa Keller	•	VU, TUAN A			
SIEMENS COR	RPORATION				
Intellectual Property Dept.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
186 Wood Aver	nue South	2124			
Iselin, NJ 088	30		DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-	Application No.	Applicant(s)	) Lo		
Advisory Action	09/697,419	MCNUTT, ALAN	V		
* Marieory Modell	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Tuan A Vu	2124			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 13 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appetexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced the substitution of the substitu	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S	See MPEP		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moteraned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	ension fee under (2) as set forth in		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);				
<ul><li>(c)</li></ul>	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	implifying the		
(d) $\square$ they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.		
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NC	T place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 4-11.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen					
10. Other:	(-/( · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

Continuation of 2. NOTE: In terms of minor informalities, the claims as amended is still having punctuation type of deficiencies. But more importantly, the alleged subject matter considered allowable by Applicants necessitates the following observations. First, the fact of combining user's instructions and kernel functions into a binary being stored on a target machine is not an allowable feature in light of well-known teachings and the prior art of record would have made this obvious. Second, the kernel-related teachings that Applicants alleged as not necessarily present in the references require further consideration, notably when the prior art does not explicitly disclose such teachings nor does the claim put forward sufficient details as to distinguish this kernel support code over what has been used in the prior art (Agrawal) citations. Third, the combined effect of having limitations as to combining user's instructions and kernel support code in the targer single chip memory and form informalities in the claim, e.g. claim 7 lack of ",", do not amount to this amendment being in appropriate shape for 1) allowance, because the latter feature is at worst just an obvious variance of prior art teachings and also because the inherency issue thus raised requires further consideration and 2) because Examiner deems that the amendements are not in proper status for a possible Appeal Brief, given the limited amount of action Examiner can do for an after Final response. Hence, the amendments will not be entered.

ANIL KHATRI PRIMARY EXAMINER